



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

The man who neglects to do for himself a fair amount of thorough Biblical study, need not attempt to satisfy himself that it is sufficient for him to accept the results of others. For he should remember that, unless he himself has conducted similar investigations, unless he has learned how to go to the root of matters, he need not expect to have any clear or accurate knowledge of results reached by this kind of work. One cannot, in fact, entirely separate "results" from methods and from the means employed to obtain them. It is only the superficial mind that is satisfied with ascertaining the mere results without endeavoring to follow out, at least in part, the means adopted to gain the results. Unless, therefore, the minister is, to some extent, able to employ the means, the results have not for him the same force. The man who is careless about means and methods is also careless about "results." The more nearly he approaches a specialist in his ability to follow or work out the results, the more clearly he will appreciate and understand results which he may not have worked out.

That there is a work for specialists to do is as certain as that ministers and laymen cannot do such work. But let us note two things: As the minister is liable to go to one extreme, the specialist is liable to go to the other. The scholar who confines himself to a single line of work, who does not have true spiritual discernment, who does not observe the practical bearing of God's word upon men and events,—such a man's decision cannot be final. Ministers are unable to bring to the study of the Word, an exhaustive acquaintance with all the departments which throw light upon it; but they *can* bring that practical knowledge, that common sense which is invaluable, and without which learning is worthless. And again; there will be found specialists in no department of study in which there are not many students. It is not possible for every man who wills, to be a specialist. The specialist in a given field is one man in a thousand, engaged in work in the same field. Unless a large number manifest an interest, and a disposition to work, there is no hope that men will be led to devote themselves especially to a single line. Out of many, there will rise up a few, who have for such work a fondness and an aptitude.

In order that ministers may be true to the profession which they have chosen or to which they have been called, in order that they may be able to avail themselves of the results reached by specialists, in order that they may counteract the often dangerous tendencies of the specialist, and, on the other hand, make it possible for specialists to be raised up, let them do the largest possible amount of honest critical and exegetical study of the Word they preach; let them show their esteem for this divine revelation, by treating it as it deserves to be treated; let them *not* suppose that there is any work for which this work ought to be substituted, or any study which should push aside the study of God's Word.

---

**The Old Testament Student and the "New Criticism."**—The editor has received many letters, called forth by recent criticism of the position taken by the STUDENT in reference to the discussion of questions relating to "Higher Criticism." Of these he ventures to publish the following, which represents, it is believed, the opinion of a very large number of those who have given the matter careful consideration.

The position taken by THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT in respect to the so-called "new" or "higher" criticism would not seem to need any justification, had it not in several instances been misunderstood. As one of its earliest, and still deeply

interested readers, I would not see it take a different course from that which its editor has so clearly outlined. This "newer" criticism presents itself not to a few scholars simply, but through cheap literature, crude newspaper discussions, and still more ill-advised sermons, it obtrudes itself on the attention of almost every man who reads at all. Our religious weeklies are not proper vehicles for the free discussion of these views. These papers enter almost every Christian home, and should serve, as indeed they do, to counteract the evil effects of a popular presentation of these views elsewhere. But surely *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* is just the place for such discussion. It reaches only a class of readers who are already acquainted with the "results" of recent criticism; who have already in a large majority of instances read more of its literature than *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* will publish in many a year; and who, moreover, are in a position to judge somewhat for themselves as to the validity of these "results." Or, if not able to do this, they are with few exceptions readers who have sense enough to suspend judgment until the critics themselves show some unmistakable signs of arriving at harmonious conclusions. I may not agree with the results set forth in a "radical" article. Indeed, I would probably disagree with them *in toto*, and yet be much interested in reading the views set forth. We have no reason to shrink from the discussion of these views, where such discussion is proper. God's word is abundantly able to take care of itself. We have seen similar attacks, conceived in the same spirit, made on the integrity of the New Testament. There has been a great flourish of trumpets, and many a man's heart has "trembled for the ark;" but the result has always been the same. The theories have been hopelessly exploded before their authors died, and the integrity of God's word has stood out clearer than ever before. To make *THE OLD TESTAMENT STUDENT* a journal for free discussion, and to make it an "organ" for rationalistic and destructive criticism are two things entirely distinct. The former I welcome; the latter I should deplore.

P. A. NORDELL,

New London, Conn.

---

## ➤BOOK NOTICES.◀

---

### KAMPHAUSEN'S HEBREW CHRONOLOGY.\*

---

Wellhausen, Stade and W. Robertson Smith agree in finding the Chronology of the book of Kings an artificial system and so generally untrustworthy. According to their theory the endeavor was made to divide the history of Israel from the Exodus to the return from the Captivity into two periods of 480 years each, the dividing line being the building of the Temple (1 Kgs. vi., 1). Each of these periods would naturally fall into twelve generations of 40 years each. It is assumed, therefore, that the years assigned to each king are modified so as to conform to this scheme. And in fact the importance of the number 40 in biblical history is obvious to the most superficial reader. That its frequent recurrence is not necessarily a proof that it rests only on artificial composition or on arbitrary alteration by the editors, is proved by Kamphausen in his recent essay on the subject.

Kamphausen carries out the process of playing with numbers in order to show that we may discover "artificial schemes" in any series of dates. The Hohenzollern family, for example, have special reason to remember the years 1640, 1740, 1840—evidently the number 40 has influenced German annalists! French history

---

\* *DIE CHRONOLOGIE DER HEBRAEISCHEN KOENIGE*. Eine geschichtliche Untersuchung von ADOLF KAMPHAUSEN, Dr. und ordentl. Prof. der Theologie in Bonn. Bonn, 1383. 104 pages octavo. A summary is to be found in Stade's *Zeitschrift fuer die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1883, pp. 193-202.